

A Joint Analysis of Gross Primary Production and Evapotranspiration of Australia Using Eddy Covariance, Remote Sensing and Land Surface Modelling Approaches

Hao Shi

February 2017

*A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*

*School of Life Sciences
University of Technology Sydney*

Certificate of original authorship

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text. I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature

Date 2017-02-15

Acknowledgements

I have experienced an amazing period in the University of Technology Sydney during the past four years. I am grateful to have a chance to work with distinguished scholars in this world on terrestrial ecosystem functioning.

I am deeply and sincerely appreciative for the guidance and support from my supervisors Prof. Derek Eamus and Dr. Longhui Li. Longhui was the first to set up this PhD project and has always encouraged me in continuing this work. Derek has taught me how to focus on the scientific questions. His suggestions have greatly helped me in developing and structuring my work.

I would like to thank Prof. Qiang Yu. Qiang is professional in ecosystem modelling and even in chats with him I learned a lot in ecosystem mechanisms and modelling. Talks with Qiang are enjoyable and many ideas are inspired.

Many thanks goes to Prof. Alfredo Huete and Dr. James Cleverly. Alfredo is a distinguished scientist in remote sensing and gave me amounts of advice in developing this thesis. Besides, Alfredo is always kind even though I had not much knowledge of remote sensing when being a beginner. James gave me a number of suggestions on writing and always patiently corrected the grammar errors in my manuscripts.

I also sincerely thank all my friends and office buddies for their support and accompany. I am most happy to share a period with them. Many thanks to all my collaborators for their valuable comments on my work. Special thanks to Dr. Xingjie Lu at CIRSO for sharing meteorological forcing data and Mike Lake at UTS for assistance in using UTS HPC.

I would also like to acknowledge the financial support from the Australian Research Council Scholarship and the UTS International Research Scholarship. Without these funding, I could

not have completed this work. Many thanks to UTS staff from the School of Life Sciences and the Graduate Research School.

The biggest thanks to my family who always support me and have scarified for me so much, especially my wife. I love you all!

Preface

Accurate estimation of gross primary production (GPP) through vegetation photosynthesis and its coupled evapotranspiration (ET) process is critical for the Earth's life support system. This thesis aims to understand the mechanisms underlying the GPP and ET processes and thus to improve the estimation of them across various spatio-temporal scales. The thesis consists of seven chapters with Chapters two to six written as journal articles. Chapters two to five focus on one of different methods such as eddy covariance, remote sensing and land surface modelling. Chapter six integrates eddy covariance observations, remote sensing products and land surface modelling to investigate the deficits existing in current models. These chapters have been published, submitted or in preparation. This thesis is compiled from above chapters with guidance and support from my supervisors and collaborators from other institutes. The details are as the following:

Chapter 2: Shi, H., L. Li, D. Eamus, J. Cleverly, A. Huete, J. Beringer, Q. Yu, E. v. Gorsel, and L. Hutley (2014), Intrinsic climate dependency of ecosystem light and water-use-efficiencies across Australian biomes, *Environmental Research Letters*, 9(10), 104002.

Chapter 3: Shi, H., L. Li, D. Eamus, A. Huete, J. Cleverly, X. Tian, Q. Yu, S. Wang, L. Montagnani, V. Magliulo, E. Rotenberg, M. Pavelka, and A. Carrara (2017), Assessing the ability of MODIS EVI to estimate terrestrial ecosystem gross primary production of multiple land cover types, *Ecological Indicators*, 72, 153-164.

Chapter 4: Shi, H., W. Zhuang, L. Li, J. Beringer, J. Cleverly, J. Dong, D. Eamus, Q. Guo, and Q. Yu (2016), Remote estimation of evapotranspiration for Australian seasonally water-limited ecosystems within an evapotranspiration-vegetation index framework, *Remote Sensing Letters*, submitted.

Chapter 5: Shi, H., L. Li, Y.-P. Wang, J. Beringer, J. Cleverly, L. Cheng, D. Eamus, L. He, X. Lu, L. Zhang, and Q. Yu (2016), Identifying and optimizing key above- and below-ground processes for carbon assimilation and evapotranspiration in the CABLE model across Australian vegetation types, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, internal review.

Chapter 6: Shi, H., L. Li, D. Eamus, X. Lu, Y.-P. Wang, J. Cleverly, J. Beringer, and Q. Yu (2016), Benchmarking the CABLE model using remote sensing GPP and ET products across Australia, *Journal of Hydrometeorology*, in prep.

Other coauthored papers include:

1. Bai, J., J. Wang, X. Chen, G. Luo, H. Shi, L. Li, and J. Li (2015), Seasonal and inter-annual variations in carbon fluxes and evapotranspiration over cotton field under drip irrigation with plastic mulch in an arid region of Northwest China, *Journal of Arid Land*, 7(2), 272-284.
2. L.H. Li, Y.P. Wang, D. Eamus, V.K. Arora, H. Shi, L. Cheng, J. Cleverly, T. Hajima, D.Y. Ji, C. Jones, M. Kawamiya, W.P. Li, J. Tjiputra, A. Wiltshire, T.W. Wu, Q. Yu, and L. Zhang (2015), Benchmarking global land surface models in CMIP5: analysis of ecosystem water- and light-use efficiencies within a Budyko framework, *Journal of Climate*, under review.
3. L.H. Li, Y.P. Wang, J. Beringer, H. Shi, D. Eamus, A. Huete, J. Cleverly (2015), Coherent and positive response of gross primary production to precipitation across Australian arid and semi-arid biomes, *Scientific Reports*, under review.
4. X.L. Yuan, L.H. Li, X. Chen, H. Shi (2015), Effects of Precipitation Intensity on NDVI-Based Grass Change over Northern China During the Period from 1982 to 2011, *Remote Sensing*, vol. 7, no. 8, doi:10.3390/rs70810164

Contents

Certificate of original authorship	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Preface	iv
Abstract	1
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	2
1.1 GPP and ET	2
1.1.1 GPP.....	2
1.1.2 Evapotranspiration (ET).....	3
1.2 Main approaches for measurements and estimation of GPP and ET	4
1.2.1 Eddy covariance method	4
1.2.2 Remote sensing techniques	5
1.2.3 Land surface models.....	6
1.3 Progress on estimation of GPP and ET	7
1.3.1 GPP estimation	7
1.3.2 ET estimation.....	9
1.4 Study area	12
1.5 Aims and overview	13
Chapter 2: Intrinsic climate dependency of ecosystem light and water-use-efficiencies across Australian biomes.....	26
Abstract.....	26
2.1 Introduction.....	26
2.2 Methods	29
2.2.1 Sites and data processing.....	29
2.2.2 Wavelet aggregation method	34
2.3 Results.....	36
2.3.1 GPP responses to PAR and ET	36

2.3.2 Relationships of eLUE and eWUE with climate	38
2.3.3 Relationships of eLUE and eWUE to SWC and LAI	41
2.3.4 Behavior of eLUE and eWUE in summer and winter	45
2.4 Discussion	47
2.4.1 Relationships between GPP, PAR and ET	47
2.4.2 Climate dependence of eLUE and eWUE among biomes	48
2.4.3 Seasonal patterns of eLUE and eWUE across biomes	49
2.5 Conclusions	50
Chapter 3. Assessing the ability of MODIS EVI to estimate terrestrial ecosystem gross primary production of multiple land cover types	58
Abstract	58
3.1 Introduction	59
3.2 Data and Methods	62
3.2.1 Eddy covariance and meteorological data	62
3.2.2 Benchmark dataset	64
3.2.3 Satellite data	65
3.2.4 Statistical analyses	69
3.3 Results	70
3.3.1 The overall relationship between GPP and iEVI without biomes categorization	70
3.3.2 Biome-specific relationships between GPP and iEVI	71
3.3.3 Global application of biome-specific GPP-iEVI relationships	76
3.3.3 LAI and precipitation effects on biome-specific GPP-iEVI relationships	80
3.4 Discussion	81
3.4.1 Uncertainty analysis	81
3.4.2 Relationships between EVI and GPP	83
3.4.3 Environmental constraints on the ability of EVI to estimate GPP	84
3.5 Conclusions	86

Chapter 4: Remote estimation of evapotranspiration for Australian seasonally water-limited ecosystems within an evapotranspiration-vegetation index framework.....	101
Abstract.....	101
4.1 Introduction.....	101
4.2 Data and Methods	103
4.2.1 Data	103
4.2.2 Development of the ET-EVI Framework	108
4.2.3 A Simple EVI-Based ET Model	109
4.3 Results.....	112
4.3.1 Performance of the TG-SM Model across Sites.....	112
4.3.2 Performance of the TG-SM Model within Sites.....	113
4.3.3 Performance of the TG-SM Model at the Regional Scale.....	116
4.4 Discussion and conclusions	119
Chapter 5. Identifying and optimizing key above- and below-ground processes for carbon assimilation and evapotranspiration in the CABLE model across Australian vegetation types	128
Abstract.....	128
5.1 Introduction	129
5.2 Data and Methods	132
5.2.1 Sites and Measurements	132
5.2.2 The CABLE Model	134
5.2.3 Sensitivity Analysis	138
5.2.4 Parameter Optimization.....	141
5.2.5 Statistical Metrics	144
5.3 Results.....	144
5.3.1 Important Parameters for GPP and Qle	144
5.3.2 Distribution of Optimized Parameters.....	146
5.3.3 Performance of Optimization at the Hourly Time-scale	148

5.3.4 Simulated SWC, GPP and ET at the Daily Time-scale	152
5.3.5 Seasonal Responses of Simulated GPP and Qle to Water Deficits	155
5.3.6 Effects of Optimization on GPP and ET at Different Time-scales	157
5.4 Discussion.....	159
5.4.1 Key Parameters and Processes for GPP and ET.....	159
5.4.2 Applications of the Model-data Fusion Framework.....	163
5.4.3 Further Model Uncertainties	164
5.5 Conclusions.....	165
Chapter 6. Benchmarking the CABLE model using remote sensing GPP and ET products across Australia.....	174
Abstract.....	174
6.1 Introduction.....	175
6.2 Data and Methods	177
6.2.1 Flux sites.....	177
6.2.2 Spatial data	178
6.2.3 Remote sensing GPP models.....	181
6.2.4 Remote sensing ET models	181
6.2.5 The CABLE Model	182
6.2.6 Data-driven product.....	183
6.2.7 Statistical metrics	183
6.3 Results.....	184
6.3.1 Temporal benchmarking.....	184
6.3.2 Spatial benchmarking	188
6.4 Discussion.....	198
6.5 Conclusions.....	201
Chapter 7. General discussion and conclusions	209
7.1 General discussion	209

7.1.1 Coupling of GPP and ET across Australian biomes	209
7.1.2 EVI-based GPP model.....	209
7.1.3 TG-SM ET model.....	210
7.1.4 Optimization of the CABLE model.....	211
7.1.5 Benchmarking CABLE using remote sensing products.....	212
7.2 Future research.....	212

List of Figures

Figure 1.1. Spatial distribution of 13 OzFlux sites. The IGBP land cover types in Australia are also shown. The acronyms WAT, ENF, EBF, DBF, MF, CSH, OSH, WSA, SAV, GRA, WET, CRO, URB, CNM, SNO and BRN denote water, evergreen needleleaf forest, evergreen broadleaf forest, deciduous broadleaf forest, mixed forest, closed shrublands, open shrublands, woody savannas, savannas, grasslands, wetlands, croplands, urban and built-up, cropland/natural vegetation mosaic, snow and ice and barren or sparsely vegetated, respectively.	13
Figure 1.2. Framework of this thesis. The horizontal axis indicates time-scale while the vertical axis indicates spatial scale. The box for thesis step represents the spatio-temporal scales at which the research is conducted. The solid arrow lines indicate methods used in the chapter while the dashed arrow lines indicate output of the chapter into following steps.	14
Figure 2.1. Average annual precipitation contour map of Australia in 30 years from 1976 to 2005 (statistics by Bureau of Meteorology, Australia), spatial distribution of selected sites and average monthly climate over the respective observation periods for each site. T indicates temperature, Prcp indicates precipitation, PAR indicates photosynthetically active radiation, and VPD indicates the vapor pressure deficit.	32
Figure 2.2. eWUE reconstruction at hourly, daily, monthly, seasonal and yearly scales using the wavelet transform at the Howard Springs site from 2004 to 2008. The reconstructed time series removes the higher frequency information in lower scales.	36
Figure 2.3. Relationships between (left) daily (GPP_d), eight day (GPP_{8d}), monthly (GPP_m) GPP and PAR and between (right) GPP and ET for seven sites. Ellipses (left) indicate 95% confidence boundaries of GPP. Bars indicate one standard deviation of annual eLUE or eWUE at each site. Also shown is the linear fit between GPP and ET (right). Annual eLUE($eLUE_{yr}$) and eWUE($eWUE_{yr}$) were calculated from annual GPP, PAR and ET.	37
Figure 2.4. Relationships between (left) daily ($eLUE_d$), eight day ($eLUE_{8d}$), monthly ($eLUE_m$) eLUE and VPD and between (right) daily ($eWUE_d$), eight day ($eWUE_{8d}$), monthly ($eWUE_m$) eWUE and VPD for seven sites. Ellipses indicate 95% confidence boundaries of eLUE and eWUE. Bars indicate one standard deviation of annual eLUE, eWUE or VPD at each site. Also shown are logarithmically fitted functions, coefficients of determination (R^2) and p values.	40

Figure 2.5. Relationships between (left) daily ($eLUE_d$), eight day ($eLUE_{8d}$), monthly ($eLUE_m$) $eLUE$ and SWC and between (right) daily ($eWUE_d$), eight day ($eWUE_{8d}$), monthly ($eWUE_m$) $eWUE$ and SWC for seven sites. Ellipses indicate 95% confidence boundaries of $eLUE$ and $eWUE$. Bars indicate one standard deviation of annual $eLUE$, $eWUE$ or SWC at each site. Also shown are logarithmically fitted functions, coefficients of determination (R^2) and p values.....	42
Figure 2.6. Relationships between (left) eight day ($eLUE_{8d}$), monthly ($eLUE_m$) and yearly ($eLUE_{yr}$) $eLUE$ and mean maximum LAI (LAI_{max}) and between (right) eight day ($eWUE_{8d}$), monthly ($eWUE_m$) and yearly ($eWUE_{yr}$) $eWUE$ and LAI_{max} for seven sites. Bars indicate standard one standard deviation of annual $eLUE$, $eWUE$ or LAI_{max} . Also shown are logarithmically or linearly fitted functions, coefficients of determination (R^2) and p values. .	44
Figure 2.7. Logarithmical relationships between (top two) monthly LUE ($eLUE_m$) and VPD and between monthly WUE ($eWUE_m$) and VPD in summer and winter, respectively. Comparisons of (bottom two) average seasonal $eLUE$ ($eLUE_{season}$) and $eWUE$ ($eWUE_{season}$) for seven sites are also shown in summer and winter, respectively. Error bars indicate the standard deviations of seasonal $eLUE$ or $eWUE$ at each site. “****”, “***”, and “*” above the error bars of each site indicate significance at 0.001, 0.01, and 0.05 levels, while “ns” represents not significant, based on t -test statistics, and these symbols above the horizontal lines represent significance at biome level.....	46
Figure 3.1. Geographical distribution of flux towers overlaid onto the 2001 MODIS IGBP land cover map at a $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ resolution.	64
Figure 3.2. Relationship between derived annual GPP from iEVI (GPP_{iEVI}) and eddy covariance tower measured GPP (GPP_{EC}) since 2000 based on all sites and across 12 different biomes. The inset shows \ln -transformed annual GPP_{EC} and annual iEVI for all site-years. The solid line represents the least squares regression line. The dashed line represents the 1:1 line.	71
Figure 3.3. Biome-specific relationships between tower-estimated annual GPP (GPP_{EC}) and iEVI. Solid lines represent GPP-iEVI relationships derived from the $\ln(GPP_{EC}) \sim \ln(iEVI)$ formulas within each biome. Coefficient of determination (R^2) represents the fit goodness of the $\ln(GPP_{EC}) \sim \ln(iEVI)$ relationship, and the root mean squared error (RMSE) represents the bias between GPP estimated using iEVI and GPP_{EC} . All relationships are statistically significant.	73

Figure 3.4. Linear correlations between observed GPP anomaly and iEVI anomaly within each biome. The anomaly is calculated as the variable values subtracting their mean.	74
Figure 3.5. Comparison of modelled annual GPP (GPP_{iEVI}) using biome-specific GPP-iEVI relationships with eddy covariance tower measured GPP (GPP_{EC}). The solid line represents the linear regression line. The dashed line represents the 1:1 line.	76
Figure 3.6. Comparison between modelled average annual GPP using iEVI (GPP_{iEVI}) (2000-2013) and the benchmark GPP (GPP_{MTE}) (1982-2008) at a grid level (left) and a biome level (right) across the globe. The red solid line represents the linear regression line and the black dashed line represents the 1:1 line. Horizontal and vertical error bars (right) indicate standard deviations of mean annual biome GPP_{iEVI} (2000-2013) and GPP_{MTE} (1982-2008), respectively.	77
Figure 3.7. Spatial comparison of (A) the mean annual GPP from iEVI (GPP_{iEVI} , $g\ C\ m^{-2}\ yr^{-1}$) (2000-2013) with (B) the benchmark GPP (GPP_{MTE} , $g\ C\ m^{-2}\ yr^{-1}$) (1982-2008) and the distribution of (C) the residual ($g\ C\ m^{-2}\ yr^{-1}$) between GPP_{iEVI} and GPP_{MTE} within the 5-95% quantile.	78
Figure 3.8. Latitudinal patterns (0.5° bands) of mean annual GPP by iEVI (GPP_{iEVI} , 2000-2013) and the benchmark (GPP_{MTE} , 1982-2008), respectively. The red shaded area represents the standard deviation of all GPP_{iEVI} values of cells along the latitude. The grey shaded area represents the standard deviation of all GPP_{MTE} values of cells along the latitude.	79
Figure 3.9. Strength (R^2) and slopes of relationships between $\ln(GPP_{EC})$ and $\ln(iEVI)$ for each biome as a function of either mean annual precipitation (Prdp, inset) or mean annual maximum LAI in each biome. Black lines represent the segmented linear regression line. The dashed vertical line indicates the breakpoint of the segmented linear relationship. The shaded area represents 95% confidence band.	80
Figure 4.1. Spatial distribution of eight OzFlux sites. The IGBP land cover types in Australia are also shown. The acronyms WAT, ENF, EBF, DBF, MF, CSH, OSH, WSA, SAV, GRA, WET, CRO, URB, CNM, SNO and BRN denote water, evergreen needleleaf forest, evergreen broadleaf forest, deciduous broadleaf forest, mixed forest, closed shrublands, open shrublands, woody savannas, savannas, grasslands, wetlands, croplands, urban and built-up, cropland/natural vegetation mosaic, snow and ice and barren or sparsely vegetated, respectively.	106

Figure 4.2. Scatterplots of measured monthly ET versus scaled monthly EVI across eight seasonally water- limited ecosystems in Australia. The inset is a conceptual diagram [Feddes <i>et al.</i> , 1978; Seneviratne <i>et al.</i> , 2010] defining energy-limited and water-limited ET regimes as a function of soil moisture (θ). θ_{wilt} is the “soil wilting point” and θ_{crit} is a critical soil moisture value. The black line represents a three-segment regression line. The coefficients of determination (R^2) and the significance values (p) for the stage 1 in water-limited domain and energy-limited domain are shown in black. The blue line is the linear regression line between ET and scaled EVI. The related regression equation and statistical values are shown in blue color.	109
Figure 4.3. Regulation effects of land surface temperature (LST, a) and soil moisture (SM, b) on ecosystem observed ET across eight Australian seasonally water-limited sites.	111
Figure 4.4. Comparison of predicted ET by TG-SM models fitted within each site with in-situ measured ET across all eight sites in Australia on a monthly basis.	113
Figure 4.5. Comparison of predicted ET and measured ET across (top) and within (bottom) eight sites. (a) Performance of the model parametrized across all sites, (b) performance of the model parametrized in only the energy-limited domain, (c) performance of the model parametrized in only the extremely water-limited domain, and (d, e and f) coefficients of determination (R^2), RMSE (mm month^{-1}) and fitted slopes of TG-SM, CABLE or MOD16A2 predicted ET against measured ET at each site on a monthly time-scale. At AU-Cap, MOD16A2 ET was not significantly correlated with observed ET. At AU-Da2, CABLE ET was correlated with observed ET at a significant level of $p < 0.05$. All correlations between estimated and observed ET were significant with $p < 0.01$ except for the CABLE model at AU-Da2 ($p < 0.05$).	114
Figure 4.6. The performance of the CABLE model at each of the eight flux sites at a monthly time-scale.....	115
Figure 4.7. The performance of MOD16A2 ET product at each of the eight flux sites at a monthly timescale.....	116
Figure 4.8. Spatial comparisons of mean annual TG-SM ET (a) and mean annual MOD16A2 ET (b) against mean annual ET-MTE (c) during 2001-2011. Figure 4.8d is the probability density distributions of spatial mean values. The red, blue and green dashed lines indicate spatial mean annual values for TG-SM, MOD16A2 and ET-MTE, respectively. Figures 4.8e, 4.8f and 4.8g are determination coefficients (R^2), RMSE and significant values of monthly	

TG-SM ET against monthly ET-MTE at the pixel level and Figure 4.8h is the probability density distribution of R^2 between TG-SM ET and ET-MTE. Figures 4.8i, 4.8j and 4.8k are determination coefficients, RMSE and significant values of monthly MOD16A2 ET against monthly ET-MTE at the pixel level and Figure 4.8l is the probability density distribution of R^2 between MOD16A2 ET and ET-MTE. Black dashed lines in Figures 4.8h and 4.8l indicate mean values of R^2 118

Figure 5.1. Sensitivities of key parameters identified by the Morris method for gross primary productivity (GPP, Figure 5.1a) and latent heat (Q_{le} , Figure 5.1b) over the study periods across ten flux sites, covering crops (CRO), evergreen broad-leaf forests (EBF), C4 grasslands (GRA), open shrublands (OSH), savannas (SAV) and woody savannas (WSA). Bars tending to be red indicate parameters involved in above-ground processes whereas bars tending to be blue indicate parameters involved in below-ground processes. 146

Figure 5.2. Boxplots of optimized values of key above-ground (red) and below-ground (blue) parameters at ten flux sites. Black cross symbols represent default values of parameters. Boxplots show first quartile, median and third quartile (box) as well as the total range of values. 147

Figure 5.3. Average diurnal cycles for net ecosystem carbon exchange (NEE) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively. The shaded area represents standard deviation of the mean observed NEE. 149

Figure 5.4. Average diurnal cycles for gross primary productivity (GPP) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively. The shaded area represents standard deviation of the mean observed GPP. 150

Figure 5.5. Average diurnal cycles for latent heat (GPP) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively. The shaded area represents standard deviation of the mean observed Q_{le} 151

Figure 5.6. Statistical metrics for CABLE performance at the hourly time-scale using default

parameters (Def), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv) and optimized parameters (Opt) at ten sites. Figures 5.6a, 5.6b and 5.6c indicate coefficient of determination (R^2) and Figures 5.6d, 5.6e and 5.6f indicate agreement index (d).	152
Figure 5.7. Mean daily soil water content (SWC) at depth 5 cm as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE at depth 5.8 cm using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively.....	153
Figure 5.8. Mean daily gross primary productivity (GPP) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively.	154
Figure 5.9. Mean daily evapotranspiration (ET) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized aboveground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively.....	155
Figure 5.10. Monthly gross primary productivity (GPP) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively. The shaded area denotes the dry season.	156
Figure 5.11. Monthly evapotranspiration (ET) as calculated from the observations (Obs, open circles) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized aboveground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively. The shaded area denotes the dry season.	157
Figure 5.12. Performance of the optimized CABLE at different time-scales. Model parameters are optimized targeted at observed hourly GPP, Q_{le} and NEE. Coefficient of determination (R^2 , solid line) and agreement index (d , dashed line) are shown at hourly (black), daily (blue) and monthly (red) time-scales. Both GPP (Figure 5.12a) and Q_{le} (Figure 5.12b) are ordered by mean annual precipitation across the ten sites.....	158
Figure 5.13. Coupling of gross primary productivity (GPP) and evapotranspiration (ET) at the annual time-scale across ten sites as calculated from the observations (Obs, dark green) and modeled by CABLE using default parameters (Def, black line), optimized above-ground parameters alone (Abv, blue line) and optimized parameters (Opt, red line), respectively. The	

solid line represents the linear regression and the dashed line indicates the linear regression using observation data. 159

Figure 6.1. Comparison of MCD12C1 biomes and the CABLE biomes. Acronyms WAT, ENF, EBF, DBF, MF, CSH, OSH, WSA, SAV, GRA, WET, CRO, URB, CNM, SNO and BRN denote water, evergreen needleleaf forest, evergreen broadleaf forest, deciduous broadleaf forest, mixed forest, closed shrublands, open shrublands, woody savannas, savannas, grasslands, wetlands, croplands, urban and built-up, cropland/natural vegetation mosaic, snow and ice and barren or sparsely vegetated, respectively. 177

Figure 6.2. Monthly gross primary production (GPP), leaf area index (LAI) and photosynthetic capacity (PC, the ratio of GPP over LAI) of different models across Australia from 2001 to 2011. The gray line indicates the product of PC-CABLE and LAI-MOD. 186

Figure 6.3. Monthly evapotranspiration (ET) and surface soil water content (SWC) of different models across Australia from 2001 to 2011. 188

Figure 6.4. Average monthly gross primary production (GPP) calculated from different models from 2001 to 2011. The unit is $\text{gC m}^{-2} \text{ month}^{-1}$ 189

Figure 6.5. The spatial distribution of per-pixel correlations and RMSE between GPP-EVI, GPP-TG, GPP-CABLE and GPP-MTE. The cross symbols indicate the correlation is not statistically significant at a p level of 0.05. 190

Figure 6.6. Average monthly photosynthetic capacity (GPP/LAI) calculated from different models from 2001 to 2011. The unit is $\text{gC LAI}^{-1} \text{ month}^{-1}$ 191

Figure 6.7. The spatial distribution of per-pixel correlations and RMSE between PC-EVI, PCTG, PC-CABLE and PC-MTE. The cross symbols indicate the correlation is not statistically significant at a p level of 0.05. 192

Figure 6.8. Average monthly leaf area index (LAI) calculated from the MCD12C1 product and the CABLE estimation during the period of 2001 to 2011. 193

Figure 6.9. The spatial distribution of per-pixel correlations and RMSE between estimated LAI and SWC by the CABLE model with LAI-MOD and SWC-ECV products. The RMSE between SWC-CABLE and SWC-ECV is multiplied by 40. The cross symbols indicate the correlation is not statistically significant at a p level of 0.05. 194

Figure 6.10. Average monthly evapotranspiration (ET) calculated from different models from 2001 to 2011. The unit is mm month^{-1} 196

Figure 6.11. The spatial distribution of per-pixel correlations and RMSE between ET-TGSM, ET-MOD, ET-CABLE and ET-MTE. The cross symbols indicate the correlation is not statistically significant at a p level of 0.05.	197
Figure 6.12. Average monthly soil water content (SWC) at soil surface layer calculated from the ECV product and the CABLE estimation during the period of 2001 to 2011.....	198

List of Tables

Table 2.1. La Thuile code, site name, latitude (Lat), longitude (Long), year of observations, altitude (Alt), biomes (Evergreen Broadleaf Forests, EBF; Savannas, Savn; Grasslands, Grass), mean maximum annual temperature (T_{\max}), mean minimum annual temperature (T_{\min}), mean annual precipitation (MAP), mean annual minimum leaf area index (LAI_{\min}) and mean annual maximum LAI (LAI_{\max}) during observation intervals for the study sites.	31
Table 2.2. Coefficients of determination (R^2) between LUE, WUE and T_a , PAR, VPD, SWC or LAI_{\max} by logarithmic/exponential (Log/Exp) and linear (Lin) fitting, respectively. ***, **, *, and NULL indicates significant relationship at $p < 0.001$, 0.01, 0.05 and not significant, respectively. Monthly(S) and Monthly(W) indicate monthly variables in summer (December, January, and February) and winter (June, January, and August).	39
Table 3.1. Summary of number of sites and site-years used for each biome. CNM: cropland/natural vegetation mosaic; CRO: croplands; CSH: closed shrublands; DBF: deciduous broadleaf forest; DNF: deciduous needle-leaf forest; EBF: evergreen broadleaf forest; ENF: evergreen needle-leaf forest; GRA: grasslands; MF: mixed forest; OSH: open shrublands; SAV: savannas; WET: permanent wetlands; WSA: woody savannas.	64
Table 3.2. Summary of the raw and leave-one-out cross-validation (CV) performance measures (coefficients of determination, R^2 ; root mean squared error, RMSE) of $\ln(\text{GPP})$ - $\ln(\text{iEVI})$ models for all data points and each biome, respectively.	75
Table 4.1. Brief description of the eight flux tower sites used to develop and validate the TG-SM model, including site identifier (ID), site name (Site), latitude (Lat, °S), longitude (Long, °E), biome type (IGBP), data period, mean annual temperature (MAT, °C), mean annual precipitation (MAP, mm yr ⁻¹) and mean annual radiation (Rad, W m ⁻² s ⁻¹). SAV denotes savannas; OSH denotes open shrublands; WSA denotes woody savannas; and GRA denotes grasslands.	104
Table 5.1. Eddy covariance data used in this study. Information includes site name (Site), latitude (Lat), longitude (Lon), vegetation type (IGBP), data observed period, mean annual temperature (MAT, °C), mean annual radiation (MAR, W m ⁻²), mean annual precipitation (MAP, mm y ⁻¹) and reference citation	133
Table 5.2. Definitions and ranges of CABLE parameters in sensitivity analysis.	141
Table 6.1. Eddy covariance data used in this study. Information includes site name (Site),	

latitude (Lat), longitude (Lon), vegetation type (IGBP), data observed period and reference citation	178
Table 6.2. Comparison of input data for various GPP and ET models. FAPAR indicates the fraction of absorbed photosynthetic active radiation (APAR), LWDown and SWDown indicate downward long- and short-wave radiation, respectively	180
Table 6.3. Key parameters used in CABLE for evergreen broad-leaf forests (EBF), open shrublands (OSH), C4 grasslands/savannas/woody savannas (C4 GRA/SAV/WSA), C3 croplands (C3 CRO), C3 grasslands (C3 GRA) and barren soils (BRN). Soil 1 is coarse sand/loamy sand, soil 2 is medium clay loam/silty clay loadm/silt loam, and soil 3 is coarse-medium sandy loam/loam. V_{cmax} is the maximum RuBP carboxylation rate at canopy top at a leaf temperature of 25 °C, a_1 is an empirical parameter in leaf stomatal model, α is the initial slope of leaf response curve of potential electron transport rate to absorbed quantum flux, G_0 is the stomatal conductance for water when leaf net photosynthesis is 0, β_r is a parameter for estimating vertical root mass distribution in soil, and ν is an empirical parameter in hydraulic conductivity function	184
Table 6.4. Statistical metrics for the performance of models on estimating GPP, ET, LAI and SWC. For spatial statistics, the significance level is calculated as the percent of pixels with significant correlations against object data at a p level of 0.05.....	187

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to analyze the patterns of gross primary production (GPP) and evapotranspiration (ET) across Australian biomes in combination of eddy covariance, remote sensing and land surface model (LSM) methods, taking advantage of their respective applicability on different space and time scales. To do this, I (1) used the wavelet method to decompose eddy covariance observed half-hourly GPP and ET into different frequencies from hourly to annual to investigate the coupling of GPP and ET and their interactions with climate and vegetation variability over hourly to annual time-scales, (2) established GPP-EVI relationships across multiple biomes using observed GPP and MODIS EVI and applied them to the global scale, (3) developed an pure remote sensing ET model (TG-SM) in combination of MODIS EVI, LST and microwave soil moisture data, (4) identified and optimized key above- and below-ground processes of GPP and ET in the CABLE model across 10 Australian flux sites, and (5) benchmarked the CABLE model across the whole Australia through integrative use of remote sensing products of GPP and ET predicted by both my own remote sensing models and other available products.

Each chapter provides new insights into the popular approach for estimating GPP or ET, while together they form a strong example in joint analysis of GPP and ET across various spatio-temporal scales.